



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT  
OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

## BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY

ISSUE NO. 6

MAY 1999

### In this issue . . .

On Violating Ethical Standards .....	1
License Grace Period Eliminated .....	2
ASPPB Certificate of Professional Qualification .....	3
Two New Board Members .....	4
Service Evaluation and Complaint Forms Online .....	4
Public Members of the Board... ..	5
Continuing Education: Laws and Ethics .....	6
Record Keeping .....	7
Written Exam Fee Increase .....	7
Senate Bills Affect Doctorate Degrees in Psychology .....	8
Domestic Violence Training .....	9
BOP Information .....	9
How to Contact the BOP Staff .....	10
Time Line .....	11
Disciplinary Actions .....	12
June 1998 Oral Exam Results .....	14
October 1998 Written Exam Results .....	17
January 1999 Oral Exam Results .....	19
Board Meeting & Exam Calendar .....	22
BOP Publications .....	23

## On Violating The Ethical Standards

By Kenneth S. Pope, Ph.D., ABPP, and Melba J. T. Vasquez, Ph.D., ABPP

*The following list is from Ethics in Psychotherapy and Counseling: A Practical Guide (2nd edition) by Kenneth S. Pope and Melba J. T. Vasquez (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998). It is reprinted here with explicit permission from the publisher, who maintains the copyright. Related material on ethics and similar topics (such as a table presenting the data from the eight national studies of therapist-client sex, an abstract of a study of psychology licensing disciplinary actions in California, and a summary of a study of ethical beliefs and behaviors of psychologists) can be found at the following website, maintained by one of the authors of the ethics book: [www.idealists.com/memories](http://www.idealists.com/memories)*

Faced with the complex demands, human costs, constant risks, and often limited resources of our work as psychologists, we may experience the very human temptation to try to make life easier for ourselves by nullifying some of our fundamental ethical responsibilities. Not wanting to view ourselves (or have others view us) as unethical, we use common fallacies and rationalizations to justify our unethical behavior and to quiet a noisy conscience. These attempts to disguise unethical behavior might be termed ethical substandards, although they are in no way ethical and many are so far beneath the standards of the profession that "sub" seems an understatement. The justifications can make even the most hurtful and reprehensible behaviors seem ethical, or at least insignificant. All of us, at one time or another, probably have endorsed at least some of them and could probably extend the list. If some excuses seem absurd and humorous to us, it is

likely that we have not yet had to resort to using those particular rationalizations. At some future moment of great stress or exceptional temptation, those funny absurdities may gain considerable plausibility if not a comforting certitude. Such substandards we commonly use to justify the unjustifiable include the following:

1. It's not unethical as long as you don't talk about ethics. The principle of general denial is at work here. As long as neither you nor your colleagues mention ethical aspects of practice, no course of action could be identified as unethical.
2. It's not unethical as long as you don't know a law, ethical principle, or professional standard that prohibits it. This substandard encompasses two principles: specific ignorance and specific literalization. The principle of specific ignorance states that even if there is, say, a law prohibiting an action, what you do is not illegal as long as you are unaware of the law. The principle of literalization states that if you cannot find specific mention of a particular incident anywhere in legal, ethical, or professional standards, it must be ethical. In desperate times,

when the specific incident is unfortunately mentioned in the standards and you are aware of it, it is still perfectly ethical as long as the standard does not mention your theoretical orientation. Thus if the formal standard prohibits sexual involvement with patients, violations of confidentiality, or diagnosing without actually meeting with the client, a behavioral, humanistic, or psychodynamic therapist may legitimately engage in these activities as long as

“...we use common fallacies and rationalizations to justify our unethical behavior and to quiet a noisy conscience.”

(Continued on page 2)



## Violating The Ethical Standards

(Continued from page 1)

- the standard does not explicitly mention behavioral, humanistic, or psychodynamic therapy.
3. It's not unethical as long as you can name at least five other clinicians right off the top of your head that do the same thing. (There are probably countless thousands more who you don't know about or who you could name if you just had the time.)
  4. It's not unethical as long as none of your clients has ever complained about it.
  5. It's not unethical as long as your client wanted you to do it.
  6. It's not unethical as long as your clients' condition (probably borderline) made them so difficult to treat and so troublesome and risky to be around that they elicited whatever it was you did (not, of course, to admit that you actually did anything).
  7. It's not unethical as long as you weren't really feeling well that day and thus couldn't be expected to perform up to your usual level of quality.
  8. It's not unethical as long as a friend of yours knew someone that said that an ethics committee somewhere once issued an opinion that it's okay.
  9. It's not unethical as long as you're sure that legal, ethical, and professional standards were made up by people who don't understand the hard realities of psychological practice.
  10. It's not unethical as long as you're sure that the people involved in enforcing standards (e.g., licensing boards, administrative law judges) are dishonest, stupid, extremist, are unlike you in some significant way, or are conspiring against you.
  11. It's not unethical as long as it results in a higher income or more prestige.
  12. It's not unethical as long as it's more convenient than doing things another way.
  13. It's not unethical as long as no one else finds out—or if whoever might find out probably wouldn't care anyway.
  14. It's not unethical as long as you're observing most of the other ethical standards. This means that everyone can, by fiat, nullify one or two ethical principles as long as the other more important standards are observed. In a pinch, it's okay to observe a majority of the standards. In a real emergency, it's acceptable simply to have observed one of the ethical principles in some situation at some time in your life, or to have thought about observing it.
  15. It's not unethical as long as there's no intent to do harm.
  16. It's not unethical as long as there is no body of universally accepted, scientific studies showing, without any doubt whatsoever, that exactly what you did was the sole cause of harm to the client. This view was vividly and succinctly stated by a member of the Texas pesticide regulatory board charged with protecting Texas citizens against undue risks from pesticides. In discussing Chlordane, a chemical used to kill termites, one member said, "Sure, it's going to kill a lot of people, but they may be dying of something else anyway." ("Perspectives," 1990, p. 17)
  17. It's not unethical as long as you don't intend to do it more than once.
  18. It's not unethical as long as no one can prove you did it.
  19. It's not unethical as long as you're an important person. The criteria for importance in this context generally include being rich, well-known, extensively published, or tenured, having a large practice, having what you think of as a "following" of like-minded people, possessing substantial malpractice liability coverage, or knowing personally someone who, in retrospect, thought APA's purchase of *Psychology Today* was a good idea. Actually, if you just think you're important, you'll have no problem finding proof.
  20. It's not unethical as long as you're busy. After all, given your workload and responsibilities, who could reasonably expect you to obtain informed consent from all your clients, keep your chart notes in a secured area, be thorough when conducting assessments, or follow every little law? ♠

## Grace Periods for License Renewals Eliminated

Effective January 1, 1999, AB 2802, authored by the Assembly Committee on Consumer Protection, became operative. This bill amends section 2984 of the Business and Professions Code by eliminating the 30-day grace period for license renewals. That means a licensee will be considered delinquent if renewal is post-marked even one day after the license expiration date. In addition, the delinquent fee is \$25.00 and will be added to the regular renewal fee the day after the expiration date if the renewal is not timely. The board asks licensees to keep this in mind and suggests that licensees note on their calendars a reminder to renew their licenses **well in advance of their expiration dates.** ♠



# ASPPB Certificate of Professional Qualification

By Stephen T. DeMers, EdD

A new program designed to ease mobility problems experienced by licensed doctoral psychologists was begun by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) on August 1, 1998.

ASPPB announces its program of individual certification designed to facilitate mobility for psychologists licensed at the doctoral level in a state, province, or territory in the U.S. or Canada. ASPPB will issue a Certificate of Professional Qualification in Psychology (CPQ) to licensed psychologists who meet standards of education preparation, supervised experience, and examination performance; have practiced for a minimum of five years; and have no history of disciplinary action. ASPPB is encouraging licensing boards in the United States and Canada to accept the CPQ as evidence of eligibility for psychology licensure in their jurisdictions.

Through the CPQ program, ASPPB hopes to improve the process for licensing psychologists already credentialed in one jurisdiction and to ease the burdens on psychology licensing boards faced with regulating an increasingly mobile profession.

Thomas Vaughn, PhD, former president of ASPPB and currently Chairperson for the ASPPB Mobility Committee, notes that the CPQ program and ASPPB's Agreement of Reciprocity are different but complementary programs. Reciprocity is an agreement between jurisdictions in which each jurisdiction agrees to recognize licenses issued by every other jurisdiction in the agreement. The ASPPB Agreement of Reciprocity has specific requirements that new applicants for licensure in each participating jurisdiction must meet. Based on the comparability in current licensure standards, the participating jurisdictions agree to accept all licensees from participating jurisdictions, even if

they were licensed under earlier, less stringent standards. Current members of the Agreement of Reciprocity are Iowa, Kentucky, Manitoba, Nevada, Oklahoma, Ontario, and Texas.

On the other hand, the CPQ program is an individually based endorsement of licensure eligibility. Potentially, it does for individuals what a reciprocity agreement does for jurisdictions. Individuals who meet established standards of training and experience can obtain the CPQ even if their jurisdiction's licensing law does not meet established standards. In endorsement, a jurisdiction agrees to recognize the CPQ as meeting most of the qualifications for licensure. Each jurisdiction decides for itself whether to recognize the CPQ.

Granting of the CPQ is based on an individual psychologist having demonstrated compliance with ASPPB-recommended standards for licensure. For psychologists who are listed in the

for psychologists to store evidence of their professional education, experience, prior licensure, and exam performance, regardless of whether they are granted a CPQ. Once archived, this information can be accessed and submitted to any psychology licensing board, thereby reducing hassles associated with documenting compliance with licensure criteria, particularly long after one's training and initial licensure.

It is important to note that the CPQ does not constitute a license to practice. It is a mechanism to facilitate the granting of a license to practice in a second or subsequent jurisdiction. Once a psychology board agrees to recognize the CPQ, it has agreed to accept a CPQ holder's educational preparation, supervised experience, and examination performance for licensure. A jurisdiction may require a CPQ holder to pass local requirements such as a jurisprudence exam (e.g., local mental health law), training on abuse reporting,

or a personal interview. Since a few jurisdictions limit licensure to psychologists trained as health service providers, a non-health service provider may obtain the CPQ yet not be eligible for licensure

in some jurisdictions.

As of December 1998, seven psychology regulatory bodies in the U.S. and Canada (British Columbia, California, Kentucky, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Ontario, and Wisconsin) have agreed to recognize the CPQ. ASPPB is working with all U.S. and Canadian psychology boards to encourage widespread adoption. ASPPB's website features a current list of states and provinces that recognize the CPQ. As more jurisdictions move to accept the CPQ, its value in facilitating mobility will increase. And even if one seeks to relocate to a jurisdiction that does not accept the CPQ, a credentials record with ASPPB

*(Continued on page 4)*

*“...ASPPB hopes to improve the process for licensing psychologists already credentialed in one jurisdiction and to ease the burdens on psychology licensing boards...”*

National or Canadian Registers of Health Service Providers in Psychology or who hold a diploma from the American Board of Professional Psychology, some requirements to obtain the CPQ are waived. A grandparenting provision is designed to ease mobility concerns for individuals whose licenses are based on a doctoral degree in 1981 or before in the United States or in 1986 or before in Canada and who apply for the CPQ by December 31, 2000. For details on the three options for qualifying for the CPQ, check ASPPB's website at [www.asppb.org](http://www.asppb.org).

A key feature of the CPQ program is its credentials bank, which provides a way





## Two New Members Appointed to Board of Psychology

**B**efore leaving office, Governor Wilson appointed two new members to the Board of Psychology. Pamela Harmell, PhD was appointed on January 1, 1999, to the licensed member position vacated by Bruce Ebert, PhD. Lisa Kalustian was appointed on January 1, 1999, to the new public member position created by the Board's successful Sunset Review legislation from last year. All positions on the board are now currently filled.

**PAMELA HARMELL, PhD**, is a native of Los Angeles and obtained her Bachelor's degree from UCLA and her Master's and Doctorate degrees from the California School of Professional Psychology. Pam has been a licensed psychologist in California since 1989.

Pam has been an adjunct professor at Pepperdine Graduate School of Education and Psychology in both the master's and doctoral programs since 1990. Prior to that she taught at Santa Monica College from 1987-1990.

Pam travels the state as a lecturer on legal and ethical issues in clinical practice and in utilizing the DSM-IV legally and ethically. Since 1989, she has practiced couple and individual therapy in her private practice in Brentwood.

Prior to being appointed to the Board of Psychology, Pam was on the Board of Directors of the Los Angeles County Psychological Association (LACPA) and was on their Ethics Committee since 1990.

Currently, Pam contributes a bimonthly article in the LACPA newsletter, the *Los Angeles Psychologist*, and is about to complete her first year of law school in Los Angeles.

**LISA KALUSTIAN** of Los Angeles served as former Governor Wilson's Deputy Cabinet Secretary. Prior to that, she served as his Deputy Press Secretary and in this position she was the former Governor's primary spokesperson on several issues including Indian gaming, health and welfare and human services as well as public education.

Previously, she was Deputy Associate Secretary for External Affairs at the California Health and Welfare Agency from 1994 to 1996.

Prior to that, she was communications manager for Heidrick & Struggles, an international executive search firm, from 1991 to 1994. She was an associate with the Wessell Company, a government relations and campaign management firm, from 1987 to 1990.

Lisa earned a bachelor's degree in psychology from the University of California, Los Angeles in 1986 and a master's degree in public administration from the University of Southern California in 1993. ♠

### **Certificate** (Continued from page 3)

will facilitate mobility by maintaining an accessible record of qualifications. If you have questions, or to request an application, send e-mail to [cpq@asppb.org](mailto:cpq@asppb.org) or write CPQ, c/o ASPPB, P.O. Box 4389, Montgomery AL 36103.

(Editor's notes: Stephen DeMers, EdD is past president of ASPPB. The California Board of Psychology was successful in implementing regulations to recognize the CPQ effective December 31, 1998. California does not qualify to participate in the ASPPB Reciprocity Agreement for two reasons: 1. California law requires acceptance of degrees from educational institutions that are not accredited but are "approved" by the California Bureau for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education and 2. California psychology licensing law includes a provision requiring acceptance of degrees deemed "equivalent" to a degree in psychology.) ♠

### now online @ BOP

#### **Customer Service Evaluation**

The board would like to remind its public that there is access to an automated online Customer Service Evaluation Form through the board's webpage at [www.dca.ca.gov/psych](http://www.dca.ca.gov/psych). The board encourages you to take advantage of this convenient way of letting us know how we're doing in the customer service department. The form can be completed and submitted online and the feedback received will assist the board to provide annual performance evaluations to its staff.

#### **Consumer Complaint Form**

The board would like to remind consumers of psychological services that there is access to an automated online Consumer Complaint Form through the board's webpage at [www.dca.ca.gov/psych](http://www.dca.ca.gov/psych). If consumers have a complaint against licensed psychologists, registered psychological assistants, or registered psychologists, or if consumers wish to report the unlicensed practice of psychology, they may do so by completing the form and submitting it online.



# Public Members of the Board of Psychology



Whenever you've attended a meeting of the California Board of Psychology or visited our web page, you have noticed that there are four members serving on the Board who are not licensed psychologists. According to the Psychology Licensing Law of the California Business and Professions Code, the Governor appoints two public members and the Senate Rules Committee and Speaker of the Assembly each appoints one. The Governor also appoints all of the licensed members. The qualifications for public members are that each shall be a resident of the state and shall not be licensed by any health care boards under the Department of Consumer Affairs. The purpose of this article is to let the public members introduce themselves, tell a little bit about their backgrounds, and say how they feel about serving on the Board.

*"I am very impressed with the dedication, compassion, and efficiency demonstrated by the Board's wonderful enforcement staff." — M. Palarea*

## MARILYN PALAREA

Following graduation from UCLA with a degree in political science, I became a patient representative at Memorial Hospital Medical Center in Long Beach. It was at Memorial where I met my husband, then a resident in internal medicine and cardiology. As a member of the California Medical Association (CMA) Auxiliary and through my involvement with the CMA, I became interested in and concerned about health issues and health care policy.

My husband has been influential in nurturing my interest in public service. He encouraged my many politics-related activities with both the CMA and in state and local politics. Through my CMA and American Medical Association (AMA) involvement, I became acquainted with Pete Wilson when he was first elected to the United States Senate. I volunteered on his next campaigns for Senate and Governor. When he was elected Governor in 1990, I decided to apply for a gubernatorial appointment and thereby become involved in another aspect of public service. In 1993, I was fortunate

to be selected for an appointment and to serve on the prestigious California Board of Psychology. Not only has my experience on the Board been extremely educational and enlightening, it has also provided me with the privilege of becoming acquainted with and working with a group of outstanding individuals.

I have served as the chairperson of the Board's Enforcement Program for the past three years. I am very impressed with the dedication, compassion, and efficiency demonstrated by the Board's wonderful enforcement staff.

## MARY MCMILLAN

Appointed by the Speaker, I have served on the Board since 1995. I bring to the Board 12 years experience with the California State Legislature as Principal Consultant to the Assembly Local Government Committee and Special Assistant to Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr., an MPA from CSU Hayward; and a BA in Political Science from the University of California, Berkeley. For the past nine years I have continued my public service in the San Mateo County Manager's Office as Legislative Director

for state and federal policy. Combined, these experiences have heightened my appreciation of the need to protect the interests of those who often cannot advocate for themselves. Many who seek and require the care of mental health professionals are among the most vulnerable consumers of health services.

I am very honored to serve California consumers of psychological services as a public member on the Board of Psychology. Licensed and public members, together with the dedicated professional staff, work hard to assure the highest quality of services for all consumers. I am confident that this is the reason the Legislature and Governor, after rigorous review, reauthorized the Board of Psychology.

## MARY ELLEN EARLY

I am the public member appointed by the Senate Rules Committee, and I have served on the Board since 1995. I have a BA in Psychology from UCLA and am currently employed as a Medical Information Systems Specialist in the Education Department of a community hospital in the San Fernando Valley. My

*"Licensed and public members, together with the dedicated professional staff, work hard to assure the highest quality of services for all consumers." — M. McMillan*

(Continued on page 6)



## Members of the Board

(Continued from page 5)

very first job in health care was as a nurse's aide in the psychiatric unit of a Chicago hospital. I was just 17 years old, and it was one of two summer jobs I held before my senior year of high school. After high school, I went back and worked part-time in the same unit for two years while I attended the University of Illinois.

While my background has been very helpful to me in understanding medical terminology, patient rights, and confidentiality issues, it has also exposed me to many people who seek mental health services. These people are not faceless strangers. They are our family, friends,

*"I have an ongoing commitment to universal health care for all people..."*  
—M.E. Early

and neighbors. They attend our schools and churches and are part of our community. Like all of us, they have a right to quality health care, including mental health care. I have an ongoing commitment to universal health care for all people and am particularly concerned because working people have health care insurance and those who do frequently have little or no coverage for mental health services. We as a society have difficult choices to make in terms of health care funding, but this must be a priority.

I chair the Consumer Education Committee of the Board of Psychology and am very impressed with the Board's website ([www.dca.ca.gov/psych](http://www.dca.ca.gov/psych)), one of our newest services. I encourage all of our readers who are online to bookmark the site and visit it often, since it is updated regularly.

*"I am happy to be continuing my service to the people of California by serving on a Board that has accomplished much with a high degree of commitment and integrity."—L. Kalustian*

### LISA KALUSTIAN

Appointed to the Board by Governor Pete Wilson on January 1, 1999, I bring to the Board background and experience in both psychology and public service. While earning a BA in psychology at UCLA, I was a student intern and employee of the California Self-Help Center, a statewide referral and research organization for self-help groups that is funded by the state Department of Mental Health and housed on campus.

I began to focus on public service during my fellowship with Coro, a foundation providing intensive hands-on training in public affairs. Following several years with a community relations/political affairs consulting firm, I worked in corporate communications while

attending USC to obtain a master's degree in public administration.

Following graduation, I was appointed by Governor Pete Wilson to serve in external affairs for the state Health and Welfare Agency. In 1996, I joined the Governor's staff as a Deputy Press Secretary, serving as the Governor's spokesperson on a wide range of issues, including health, consumer issues, and legal issues. Subsequently, I was appointed as the Governor's Deputy Cabinet Secretary, overseeing all health, welfare, and education policy. I am happy to be continuing my service to the people of California by serving on a Board that has accomplished much with a high degree of commitment and integrity.

---

## Continuing Education Course Requirements: LAWS AND ETHICS

On January 1, 1999, section 1397.61(b) of the Code of Regulations became inoperative. This section of the regulations had required that every licensee show evidence of having taken a continuing education course in the detection and treatment of alcohol and other chemical substance dependency during the first renewal period after January 1, 1997. Replacing this requirement, section 1397.61(c) was promulgated to require that any psychologist renewing a license on or after January 1, 2000, must show evidence that a course of no fewer than four hours on the subject of laws and ethics has been completed. This requirement must be met for each and every renewal cycle thereafter. Each licensee taking the course needs to ensure that the course covers the topics of laws and regulations related to the practice of psychology in California, recent changes/updates in ethics codes and practice, current accepted standards of practice, and application of ethical principles in the independent practice of psychology. Each licensee must certify under penalty of perjury to having completed the four-hour course on his/her renewal form. ♠



# RECORD KEEPING

By Emil Rodolfa, Ph.D. and Pamela Harmell, Ph.D.

Over the past few years, the Board has received requests for guidance regarding the length of time patient records should be kept. The following paragraphs summarize the most recent and pertinent professional guidelines and state regulations regarding record keeping. The American Psychological Association Ethical Standards (APA, 1992) state; "Psychologists maintain appropriate confidentiality in creating, storing, accessing, transferring and disposing of records under their control, whether these are written, automated, or in any other medium. Psychologists maintain and dispose of records in accordance with law and in a manner that permits compliance with the requirements of this Ethics code."

In 1993, the APA published "Record Keeping Guidelines," which highlighted that psychologists are obligated to keep records for the benefit of the patient and the psychologist. APA emphasized that records should conform to applicable legal standards and recommends that complete records should be kept for a minimum of three years after the last patient contact. In addition, the records or a summary of the records should be maintained for an additional 12 years.

According to APA standards, records should be maintained for a minimum of 15 years following the final patient contact.

Psychologists should use the same standards for retaining the records of any trainee, intern or psychological assistant that they supervise.

APA recommends that records for minors should be maintained for three years after the child reaches the age of majority.

APA provided one standard. In January 1995, however, the California Health and Safety Code (H&S section 123145) charged practitioners with maintaining all patient records for a minimum of seven years and at least one year after a minor has reached the age of 18 and in no case less than seven years.

Thus, State regulation and professional association guidelines provide different standards to take into account when psychologists decide how long to maintain case records. No matter how long a psychologist maintains patient records, plans should be made for the control and disposal of records in the event of the death of the psychologist.



## The following resources provide guidance regarding record keeping:

American Psychological Association (1993) Record Keeping Guidelines, *American Psychologist*, 48 (9) 984-986.

American Psychological Association (1992) Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct, *American Psychologist*.

Caudill, B. and Pope, K. (1995) *Laws and Mental Health Professional in California* Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Caudill, B. and Pope, K. (1995) *Laws and Mental Health Professional in California 1999 Supplement*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Keith-Spiegel, P. and Koocher, G. (1985) *Ethics In Psychology: Professional Standards and Cases*, New York: Random House.

Pope, K., and Vasquez, M. (1991) *Ethics in Psychotherapy and Counseling: A Practical Guide For Psychologists*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Soisson, E., VanderCreek, L., and Knapp, S. (1987) Thorough Record Keeping: A Good Defense in a Litigious Era, *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 18 (5), 498-502

Stromberg, C. et al. (1988) *The Psychologist's Legal Handbook*, The Council for the National Register of Health Service Providers in Psychology.

California Health and Safety Code, Section 123145 (1995)

## National Written Examination Fee Increase

**Effective November 21, 1998**, the fee for the Examination for Professional Practice of Psychology (EPPP) was increased from \$332.00 to \$432.00. This increase is a result of costs to the board for each booklet of the EPPP. The April 14, 1999, administration of the EPPP will be the first one affected by this fee increase.

A reminder to all applicants for the written or oral examination: Section 2941 of the Business and Professions Code mandates that all examination fees must be paid to the board in advance, at least 30 days prior to the examination date. If the fee is not received by this statutorily mandated deadline, the candidate cannot be scheduled to sit for that administration of the exam. The board has no authority to make any exception to this statute. ♠





# Attention: Licensed Psychologists and Educational Institutions Offering Doctorate Degrees in Psychology

**O**n August 24, 1998, Senate Bill 983, authored by Senators Richard Polanco and Richard Rainey, was approved by the Legislature, and on September 24, 1998, the bill was signed into law by Governor Wilson. Effective January 1, 1999, this bill will add two new sections to the Psychology Licensing Law. This new law adds Section 2914.2, which states: "The board shall encourage licensed psychologists to take continuing education courses in psychopharmacology and biological bases of behavior as part of their continuing education."

Pursuant to this new statute, the Board of Psychology encourages all California-licensed psychologists to include quality courses in psychopharmacology and biological bases of behavior as part of their overall plans for meeting the mandated continuing education requirements for license renewal. This new law adds Section 2914.3(a), which states: "The board shall encourage institutions that offer a doctorate degree program in psychology to include in their biobehavioral curriculum, education and training in psychopharmacology and related topics including pharmacology and clinical pharmacology."

Pursuant to the new statute, the Board of Psychology encourages educational institutions offering doctoral programs that meet the psychology licensing requirements to include quality coursework and training in the topics mentioned in this statute.

This new law adds Section 2914.3(b), which states: "The board shall develop guidelines for the basic education and training of psychologists whose practices include patients with medical conditions and patients with mental and emotional disorders, who may require psychopharmacological treatment and whose

management may require collaboration with physicians and other licensed prescribers. In developing these guidelines for training, the board shall consider, but not be limited to, all of the following:

1. The American Psychological Association's guidelines for training in the biological bases of mental and emotional disorders.
2. The necessary educational foundation for understanding the biochemical and physiological bases for mental disorders.
3. Evaluation of the response to psychotropic compounds, including the effects and side effects.
4. Competent basic practical and theoretical knowledge of neuroanatomy, neurochemistry, and neurophysiology relevant to research and clinical practice.
5. Knowledge of the biological bases of psychopharmacology.
6. The locus of action of psychoactive substances and mechanisms by which these substances affect brain function and other systems of the body.
7. Knowledge of the psychopharmacology of classes of drugs commonly used to treat mental disorders.
8. Drugs that are commonly abused that may or may not have therapeutic uses.
9. Education of patients and significant support persons in the risks, benefits, and treatment alternatives to medication.
10. Appropriate collaboration or consultation with physicians or other prescribers to include the assessment of the need for additional treatment that may include medication or other medical evaluation and treatment and the patient's mental



*(Continued on page 9)*





## Doctorate Degrees

(Continued from page 8)

capacity to consent to additional treatment to enhance both the physical and the mental status of the persons being treated.

11. Knowledge of signs that warrant consideration for referral to a physician.

In 1999, the board will work with the California Psychological Association, the American Psychological Association, and other interested parties to develop the guidelines mandated by this new law. Once the guidelines are completed, they will be posted prominently on the board's web page.

Finally, this new law adds Section 2914.3(c), which states:

"This section is intended to provide for training of clinical psychologists to improve the ability of clinical psychologists to collaborate with physicians. It is not intended to provide for training psychologists to prescribe medication. Nothing in this section is intended to expand the scope of licensure of psychologists."

The board has received many inquiries about Senate Bill 983, and clearly there is much confusion throughout the country about what the bill actually does. The board hopes the above information clarifies what this piece of legislation truly accomplishes. ♠

## An Update on Domestic Violence Training

Senate Bill 1995 (O'Connell, Chapter 761) was passed by the Legislature and signed into law by Governor Wilson on September 21, 1996. This bill amended Section 3111 of the California Family Code to state that "on or after January 1, 1998, no person shall be a court-appointed investigator under this chapter unless the person has completed the domestic violence training program described in Section 1816" of the same code. Further, this new legislation states that "the Judicial Council shall draft a statewide rule of court requiring domestic violence training for all court-appointed persons who evaluate or investigate child custody matters." This requirement, therefore, does not apply to all psychologists, but only to those who serve as court-

appointed evaluators or investigators in the Family Court.

On a similar note, subsection (f) was added by the Legislature to Section 2914 of the Business and Professions Code. Section 2914, as you know, states the licensing requirements for psychologists. Subsection (f) adds a new requirement for those future applicants who began their graduate training on or after January 1, 1995. These applicants must have coursework in spousal or partner abuse assessment, detection and intervention. This is a onetime course requirement that must be met prior to licensure only by those future applicants who began their graduate training on or after January 1, 1995. ♠

## BOP Information

**Did you know** that the address listed on your BOP Update mailing label is your address of record? This is the address given to the public upon request, and where your license renewal forms are sent. If you wish to change this address, you must send a written request to the Board office in Sacramento. This information can also be e-mailed to the Board (bopmail@dca.ca.gov). The Board recommends that you do not use your residence address as your address of record for obvious reasons.

**Preparing to sit** for the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP)? Did you know that 350 items from previous exams (with answers) are available from the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB)? The included exam items span the dimensions of the content outline and are intended to give candidates for licensure a sense of what to expect from the EPPP. For information on cost and how to order, write to: ASPPB, P.O. Box 4389, Montgomery, AL 36103.



# How to Contact the Board of Psychology Staff

It is astounding to note that the Board of Psychology, with a staff of about a dozen, receives and processes 300 to 500 telephone calls per day. This processing of calls includes those that contact the elaborate information menu available when calling the public number. Unfortunately, because of this tremendous volume of calls and the meager staff size, some callers end up frustrated, unable to obtain the information that they need. The following information provides helpful hints of how our public can more efficiently communicate with us and obtain the information being sought.

First and foremost, for answers to general questions and information, email through the board's webpage. Just click on the "Email Us" button and you will receive a response - generally within 24 hours. You

can request board publications, applications, address changes, and many other services simply by emailing us through our webpage.

If you are an applicant for a license, a psychological assistant registration or for being a registered psychologist, you can email the specific staff person assigned to your application. The board has three analysts to process applications. Please remember, the more telephone calls these three staff persons must attend to, the slower the processing of all applications. Most of your application questions can be answered by exploring the board's web page.

For efficiency's sake, the board strongly encourages all applicants to communicate with their licensing analyst or registration clerk via email. This way, valuable time

is not lost playing telephone tag. You will receive a response within 24 hours. If you do not receive a prompt response, please let the board know via the Customer Satisfaction Survey, which you can complete and send on the board's webpage.

The following information includes the names and titles of those board staff persons who are able to directly assist you. Also included is each person's work schedule, the staff person's phone number and extension, and the staff person's direct email address. On behalf of the Board of Psychology, we hope that this information proves helpful to you in obtaining more efficient service from the board's staff office. ♠

---

**Board Contact Information Address:**

1422 Howe Avenue, Suite 22  
Sacramento, CA 95825-3200

**Email (General Questions/Services):**

bopmail@dca.ca.gov

**Webpage:** [www.dca.ca.gov/psych](http://www.dca.ca.gov/psych)**Staff Evaluation Form:**

[www.dca.ca.gov/psych/survey.htm](http://www.dca.ca.gov/psych/survey.htm)

**Telephone:** (916) 263-2699

---

**Thomas O'Connor, Executive Officer**

[Thomas\\_O'Connor@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Thomas_O'Connor@dca.ca.gov)

**Suzanne Taylor, Enforcement Coordinator**

[Suzanne\\_Taylor@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Suzanne_Taylor@dca.ca.gov)  
Tues. - Fri.: 7:00 am to 5:30 pm  
(916) 263-2693

**Karen Johnson, Licensing/Exam Coordinator**

[Karen\\_Johnson@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Karen_Johnson@dca.ca.gov)  
Mon. - Thurs.: 7:00 am to 5:30 pm  
(916) 263-2694

**Jeffrey Thomas, Special Projects Coordinator**

[Jeff\\_Thomas@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Jeff_Thomas@dca.ca.gov)  
Mon. - Fri.: 8:00 am to 5:00 pm  
(916) 263-1617

**Kathi Burns, Enforcement Analyst**

[Kathi\\_Burns@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Kathi_Burns@dca.ca.gov)  
Mon. - Fri.: 7:00 am to 3:30 p.m.  
(916) 263-0321

**Richard Hodgkin, Licensing/Registration Analyst A-G**

[Richard\\_Hodgkin@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Richard_Hodgkin@dca.ca.gov)  
Mon. - Thurs.: 7:00 am to 5:30 pm  
(916) 263-2699, Ext. 3304

**Annette Brown, Licensing/Registration Analyst H-O**

[Annette\\_Brown@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Annette_Brown@dca.ca.gov)  
Mon. - Fri.: 8:00 am to 5:00 pm  
(916) 263-2699, Ext. 3305

**Jeane Ward, Licensing/Registration Analyst P-Z**

[Jeane\\_Ward@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Jeane_Ward@dca.ca.gov)  
Every other Monday off:  
7:30 am to 5:00 pm  
(916) 263-2699, Ext. 3303

**Al Anquoe, Post-Licensure Problems**

[Al\\_Anquoe@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Al_Anquoe@dca.ca.gov)  
Mon. - Fri.: 8:00 am to 5:00 pm  
(916) 263-2699 Ext. 3302

**Wanda Hawkins, Continuing Education Technician**

[Wanda\\_Hawkins@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Wanda_Hawkins@dca.ca.gov)  
Mon. - Fri.: 8:00 am to 4:30 pm  
(916) 263-2699, Ext. 3312

**Janet Wise, Enforcement Clerk**

[Janet\\_Wise@dca.ca.gov](mailto:Janet_Wise@dca.ca.gov)  
Mon. - Fri.: 8:00 am to 3:00 pm  
(916) 263-2691



## TIME LINE

### *Legal/Ethical Landmarks: Psychologist/Patient Sexual Misconduct*

- 1980** Section 730 of the general provisions of the California Business & Professions Code establishes sexual abuse, misconduct or relations with a patient as a cause for disciplinary action against those specified licensees including psychologists. (Stats. 1979, Chapter #955 (AB1072, Rosenthal))
- 1980** Legislation enacted to establish sexual misconduct as cause for psychologist license discipline specifically in the Psychology Licensing Law (2960 (o)). (Stats. 1979, Chapter #955 (AB 1072, Rosenthal))
- 1981** American Psychological Association Ethical Principle 6A: Sexual intimacies with clients are unethical.
- 1982** Section 730 renumbered to section 726. (Stats. 1981, Chapter #714 (SB 1192, Rains))
- 1988** California Civil Code section 43.93: A civil cause of action exists for injury caused by sexual contact with a patient or former patient within two years following termination of therapy. (Stats. 1987, Chapter #1474 (SB 1406, Watson))
- 1988** Section 337 of the Business & Professions Code: Requires DCA to produce a brochure for victims of psychotherapist-patient sex and advocates for those victims. (Stats. 1987, Chapter #1448 (SB 1277, Watson))
- 1988** Section 728 of the Business & Professions Code: Requires psychologists who are made aware by a patient that the patient has been a victim of sexual misconduct by a prior or concurrent psychotherapist to provide the patient with the brochure *Professional Therapy Never Includes Sex* and to discuss the contents of the brochure with the patient. (Stats. 1987, Chapter #1448 (SB 1277, Watson))
- 1990** Section 729 of the general provisions of the California Business & Professions Code criminalizes sexual misconduct with patients. Establishes such behavior as a crime when the psychotherapeutic relationship was terminated in order to engage in sex with a patient. (Stats. 1989, Chapter #795 (SB 1004, Boatwright))
- 1992** American Psychological Association Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct: Proscription against sex with patients and former patients within two years after termination of therapy and even then requires a demonstration that there is no implied exploitation or abuse.
- 1993** Section 2960 (n) split to separate fraud from sexual misconduct. Fraud remains subsection (n) while sexual misconduct becomes subsection (o). (Stats. 1992, Chapter #1099 (AB 3034, Polanco))
- 1995** Section 2960.1 added to require mandatory revocation of license in cases wherein an Administrative Law Judge makes a finding of fact that sexual misconduct has occurred. (Stats. 1994, Chapter #1274 (SB 2039, McCorquodale))
- 1999** Section 2960(p) amended to prohibit sexual relations with a patient within two years after termination of therapy. (Stats. 1998, Chapter #879 (SB 2238, Polanco))

*NOTE: Statutes enacted become effective on January 1 following the year in which they are enacted, unless they are urgency statutes. None of the above statutes were enacted as urgency statutes.*



July 1, 1998 – April 30, 1999

## Disciplinary Actions

*NOTICE: The following decisions become operative on the effective date, except in situations where the licensee obtains a court-ordered stay. A stay may occur after the publication of this newsletter. For updated information on stay orders and appeals, you may telephone (916) 263-0321 and speak to the Board's Enforcement Analyst. To order copies of these decisions and other documents, send your written request by mail or e-mail the Board's website at [www.dca.ca.gov/psych](http://www.dca.ca.gov/psych). Include the name and license number of the licensee and send to the attention of the Enforcement Program at the Board's offices in Sacramento. Please note that there is a minimal charge for copying these documents.*



**Abrams, Gary, Ph.D. (PSY 5803)**  
**La Mirada, CA**

B&P Code §§ 801, 2960 (a)(i)(k)(n), 2963. Convicted of two felony counts for grand theft which were later reduced to misdemeanor convictions. Stipulated Decision effective January 16, 1999. License revoked, stayed, 5 years' probation.

**Arden, Jeffrey, Ph.D. (PSY 9687)**  
**San Dimas, CA**

B&P Code §§ 2960(a). 1997 Conviction for receiving illegal kickbacks. Stipulated Decision effective April 1, 1999. License revoked, stayed, 3 years' probation.

**Bonafiglia, Curtis, (PSY 26963)**  
**Los Angeles, CA**

B&P Code §§ 2960(a)(b)(e)(n), 480(a)(1)(c). 1989 conviction for criminal mischief and possession of drugs. Failed to disclose convictions on first two application for registration as a psychological assistant. Stipulated Decision effective March 25, 1999. Registration granted, revoked, stayed, 3 years' probation.

**Bowers, Kenneth, Ph.D. (PSY 6223)**  
**Oxnard, CA**

Violated probation by failing to obey all laws, as evidenced by testing positive for tetrahydrocannabinol (THC). Default Decision effective July 3, 1998. License revoked.

**Brown, Stephen W., Ph.D. (PSY 3412)**  
**Huntington Beach, CA**

B&P Code §§ 2960 and 2060(j). Gross negligence and unprofessional conduct in that respondent used his superior position as a professor to take advantage of a student that resulted in the student allowing a back massage and inappropriate sexual touching by respondent. Decision effective April 29, 1999. License revoked, stayed, 5 years' probation.

**Buffington, Michael**  
**Northridge, CA**

B&P Code §§ 2960(a)(e)(j)(n)(o), 480, 726, 729. Conviction in 1997 for sexual exploitation of a patient and sexual misconduct and gross negligence regarding a second patient. Default Decision effective January 22, 1999. Application for license denied.

**Campbell, Susan M., Ph.D. (PSY 5102)**  
**Sebastopol, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective December 31, 1998. License surrender.

**Cline, Kelly, Ph.D.**  
**Santa Monica, CA**

B&P Code §§ 2960(a), 2963. Convicted for possession of a device for injection or smoking controlled substances and reckless driving. Used alcohol in a dangerous manner. Default Decision effective July 3, 1998. Registration as a psychological assistant denied.

**Fraga, Michael A.**  
**Rohnert Park, CA**

B&P Code §§ 2960(b), 480(c). Provided false statement(s) on an application filed with the Board; used alcohol in a dangerous manner. Decision effective when applicant meets requirements for registration as a registered psychologist. Application denied, stayed, 5 years' probation.

**Gouger, Sandhya Cynthia., Ph.D. (PSY 6197)**  
**La Jolla, CA**

B&P Code §§ 2960(a)(n). Committed a dishonest, fraudulent, or corrupt act and was convicted of a crime for modifying/altering a medical record of a patient with fraudulent intent. Stipulated Decision effective August 29, 1998. Revoked, stayed, 5 years' probation with 120 days' suspension.

**Grimes, Barbara, Ph.D. (PSY 8798)**  
**Laguna Niguel, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective July 3, 1998. License surrender.

**Hanlon, Wayne Edward, Ph.D. (PSY 5017)**  
**Irvine, CA**

B&P Code §§ 2960(j) and (k). Gross negligence in that respondent used vulgar language with patients and suggested that they hug and/or kiss him on the cheek although it made the patients uncomfortable. Decision effective January 21, 1999. License revoked, stayed, 20 days' suspension, 5 years' probation.

*(Continued on page 13)*





## Disciplinary Actions

(Continued from page 12)

**Light, Howard W., Ph.D. (PSY 8563)**  
**Santa Rosa, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective April 24, 1999. License surrender.

**Lipson, David, Ph.D. (PSY 9287)**  
**San Diego, CA**

B&P Code § 822. Mental illness. Decision effective July 30, 1998. License revoked.

**McCaul, Brad, Ph.D. (PSY 19114)**  
**Red Bluff, CA**

B&P Code §§ 2960(c)(h)(i)(j)(k)(r). Gross negligence, misrepresentation of type and status of license, willful unauthorized communication of information received in professional confidence and repeated negligent acts. Stipulated Decision effective October 2, 1998. License revoked.

**Metz, Max, Ph.D. (PSY 12700)**  
**San Diego, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective March 31, 1999. License surrender.

**Mickel, Audrey, Ph.D. (PSY 11091)**  
**Greenbrae, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective April 1, 1999. License surrender.

**Oraker, James R., Ph.D. (PSY 3723)**  
**Colorado Springs, CO**

Stipulated Decision effective October 2, 1998. License surrender.

**Revetto, Joseph, Ph.D. (PSY 16033)**  
**Highland, CA**

B&P Code §§ 480(a)(1), 480(a)(3) and 2960(a). 1990 convictions for making annoying telephone calls and annoying or molesting a minor. Decision effective December 2, 1998. Application for license granted, revoked, stayed, 4 years' probation. May not treat female patients during probationary period.

**Rofsky, Marvin, Ph.D. (PSY 7057)**  
**Long Beach, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective December 25, 1998. License surrender.

**Streifel, John, Ph.D. (PSY 6614)**  
**Camarillo, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective December 5, 1998. License surrender.

**Starkman, Steven, Ph.D.**  
**Whittier, CA**

B&P Code §§ 2960(a), 480(a)(1)(3). Convicted of a crime for inflicting corporal punishment on a cohabitant. Stipulated Decision to become effective upon respondent meeting all requirements for licensure in California. License granted, revoked, stayed, 3 years' probation.

**Striano, Judith, Ph.D. (PSY 7831)**  
**New York, NY**

B&P Code §§ 2960 (h)(i)(j)(k)(p)(r). Gross negligence; breach of confidentiality; disciplinary action taken by another agency; dishonest, corrupt, or fraudulent acts; functioning outside field of education, training, and experience, and repeated negligent acts in the treatment of an elderly patient. Default Decision effective July 25, 1998. License revoked.

## Explanation of Disciplinary Language

**REVOKED**—*The license is canceled, voided, annulled, rescinded. The right to practice is ended.*

**REVOKED, STAYED, PROBATION**—*"Stayed" means the revocation is postponed, put off. Professional practice may continue so long as the licensee complies with specific probationary terms and conditions. Violation of probation may result in the revocation that was postponed.*

**SUSPENSION**—*The licensee is prohibited from practicing for a specific period of time.*

**GROSS NEGLIGENCE**  
—*An extreme departure from the standard of practice.*

**DEFAULT DECISION**  
—*Licensee fails to respond to Accusation by filing a Notice of Defense, or fails to appear at administrative hearing.*

### LICENSE SURRENDER

—*While charges are still pending, the licensee turns in the license—subject to acceptance by the Board. The right to practice is ended.*

### EFFECTIVE DECISION DATE

—*The date the disciplinary decision goes into operation.*



## June 1998 Oral Exam Results

School	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
American Commonwealth University, San Diego	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Brigham Young University	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
Biola University, La Mirada	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
City University of New York	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
California Coast University - <i>GRANDFATHER ONLY</i>	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
California Graduate Institute, West Los Angeles	20	9	45.00	11	55.00
California Graduate School of Family Psychology	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
California Institute of Integral Studies, S.F.	6	1	16.67	5	83.33
California School of Professional Psychology, Berkeley	45	25	55.56	20	44.44
California School of Professional Psychology, Fresno	19	10	52.63	9	47.37
California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles	67	43	64.18	24	35.82
California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego	41	34	82.93	7	17.07
California State University, Los Angeles	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Cambridge Graduate School of Psychology, Los Angeles	4	3	75.00	1	25.00
Center for Psychological Studies, Albany	6	2	33.33	4	66.67
Claremont Graduate School, Claremont	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Drexel University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Florida State University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara	6	3	50.00	3	50.00
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena	7	3	42.86	4	57.14
Harvard University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Hofstra University, Hempstead, N.Y.	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Howard University, Washington, D.C.	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Indiana University	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Illinois Institute of Technology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, Menlo Park	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
International College, Los Angeles	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
La Jolla University, San Diego	4	3	75.00	1	25.00
Louisiana State Univ. & A&M College, Baton Rouge	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Michigan State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
New York University	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
Northern California Graduate University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Nova Southeastern University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
New School for Social Research	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Newport University, Newport Beach	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
North Texas University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Northern Arizona University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Ohio State University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Oklahoma State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Out-of-Country	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Out-of-State	7	4	57.14	3	42.86
Pepperdine University, Culver City	5	5	100.00	0	00.00

(Continued on page 15)



## June 1998 Oral Exam Results

(Continued from page 14)

School	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
Professional School of Psychological Studies	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	22	10	45.45	12	54.55
Pacific University Forest Grove Oregon	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Pacifica Graduate Institute, Santa Clara	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Pepperdine University, Malibu	5	5	100.00	0	00.00
Professional School of Psychological Studies	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
Professional School of Psychology	13	5	38.46	8	61.54
Rutgers	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Rosebridge Graduate School of Integrative Psychology	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Rosemead School of Psychology, La Mirada	6	3	50.00	3	50.00
Ryokan College, Los Angeles	7	5	71.43	2	28.57
Stanford University	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
Suny Albany	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Suny Binghamton	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
Sierra University/A University Without Walls	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
State Univ. of New York, Stony Brook	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
State University of New York, Buffalo	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Teachers College, Columbia University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Temple University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Texas Tech University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
The San Francisco School of Psychology	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
UC, Berkeley	5	1	20.00	4	80.00
UC, Los Angeles	10	9	90.00	1	10.00
UC, San Diego	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
UC, San Francisco	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
UC, Santa Barbara	4	3	75.00	1	25.00
Union Institute	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
University Arkansas	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University Barcelona	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University California Irvine	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University California Santa Cruz	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Chicago	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Cincinnati	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University Colorado	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University Delaware	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Denver	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
University Hartford	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
University Houston, Texas	3	3	100.00	0	00.00
University Illinois at Chicago	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Miami	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Michigan	3	3	100.00	0	00.00
University Minnesota, Duluth	1	0	00.00	1	100.00

(Continued on page 16)



## June 1998 Oral Exam Results

(Continued from page 15)

School	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
University Mississippi	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Missouri, Columbia	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University Missouri, Kansas City	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University North Texas	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University Oregon	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University Pennsylvania	4	4	100.00	0	00.00
University Pittsburgh	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Rhode Island	3	3	100.00	0	00.00
University South Florida	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Tennessee, Knoxville	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Texas, Austin	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
University Virginia	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University Wisconsin, Milwaukee	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Union Institute	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
United States International University, San Diego	38	14	36.84	24	63.16
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Wyoming, Laramie	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Iberoamerica, Mexico City	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University for Humanistic Studies, San Diego	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
University of Hawaii	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University of Maryland, College Park	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Maryland, College Park	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University of Nebraska, Lincoln	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Oklahoma	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of San Francisco, San Francisco	6	3	50.00	3	50.00
University of Southern California, Los Angeles	9	6	66.67	3	33.33
University of Washington	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Wisconsin - Madison	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of the Pacific, Stockton	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Vanderbilt University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Wayne State University, Michigan	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
West Virginia University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Western American University (was Univ. of Prof. Studies)	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Western Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
William Lyon University, San Diego	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Wright Institute Los Angeles, Los Angeles	6	4	66.67	2	33.33
Wright Institute, Berkeley	17	9	52.94	8	47.06
Yale University - New Haven	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Yeshiva University - Bronx, NY	1	1	100.00	0	00.00

### \*GRAND TOTAL

554 322 58.12 232 41.88

\* Total includes scores for the *Jurisprudence and Professional Ethics Oral Examination*





## October 21, 1998 Written Exam Results

School	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
Adelphi University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Arizona State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Boston University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Brigham Young University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Baylor University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Biola University, La Mirada	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
California Graduate School of Psychology	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
California Coast University - <i>GRANDFATHER ONLY</i>	9	0	00.00	9	100.00
California Graduate Institute, West Los Angeles	19	9	47.37	10	52.63
California Graduate School of Family Psychology	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
California Institute of Integral Studies, S.F.	5	3	60.00	2	40.00
California School of Professional Psychology, Berkeley	47	34	72.34	13	27.66
California School of Professional Psychology, Fresno	14	2	14.29	12	85.71
California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles	80	45	56.25	35	43.75
California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego	23	18	78.26	5	21.74
Cambridge Graduate School of Psychology, Los Angeles	6	0	00.00	6	100.00
Center for Psychological Studies, Albany	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Claremont Graduate School, Claremont	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Depaul University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Florida State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Fordham University, New York	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara	4	3	75.00	1	25.00
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena	9	7	77.78	2	22.22
Georgia School of Professional Psychology	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Illinois School of Professional Psychology	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, Menlo Park	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
International College, Los Angeles	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Louisiana State Univ. & A&M College, Baton Rouge	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Lyon University, France	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Minnesota School of Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Northern California Graduate University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Northwestern University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Newport University, Newport Beach	4	0	00.00	4	100.00
Out-of-Country	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
Out-of-State	8	7	87.50	1	12.50
Pepperdine University, Culver City	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Punjab University, India	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	16	10	62.50	6	37.50
Pacific Western University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Pacifica Graduate Institute, Santa Clara	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Pepperdine University, Malibu	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Professional School of Psychological Studies	1	0	00.00	1	100.00

(Continued on page 18)



## October 21, 1998 Written Exam Results

(Continued from page 17)

School	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
Professional School of Psychology	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
Rutgers	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Rosebridge Graduate School of Integrative Psychology	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Rosemead School of Psychology, La Mirada	5	5	100.00	0	00.00
Ryokan College, Los Angeles	6	3	50.00	3	50.00
Saybrook Institute, San Francisco (AKA: Humanistic	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Sierra University/A University Without Walls	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Teachers College, Columbia University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Temple University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Texas Tech University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
The San Francisco School of Psychology	7	2	28.57	5	71.43
Tufts University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
UC, Berkeley	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
UC, Los Angeles	8	7	87.50	1	12.50
UC, San Diego	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
UC, San Francisco	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Union Institute	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University Alabama	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University Arkansas	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Denver	3	3	100.00	0	00.00
University Illinois at Chicago	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University North Texas	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Pennsylvania	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Tennessee, Knoxville	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University Texas, Austin	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Utah	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Union Institute	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
United States International University, San Diego	25	8	32.00	17	68.00
Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University for Humanistic Studies, San Diego	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
University of Maryland, College Park	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of San Francisco, San Francisco	6	2	33.33	4	66.67
University of Southern California, Los Angeles	14	10	71.43	4	28.57
University of the Pacific, Stockton	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Virginia Commonwealth University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Wayne State University, Michigan	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Western Michigan University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Washington State University	7	4	57.14	3	42.86
West Virginia University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Western American University (was Univ. of Professional Studies)	7	1	14.29	6	85.71
Western Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
William Lyon University, San Diego	2	0	00.00	2	100.00

(Continued on page 19)



## October 21, 1998 Written Exam Results

(Continued from page 18)

School	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
Wright Institute Los Angeles, Los Angeles	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Wright Institute, Berkeley	12	8	66.67	4	33.33
Wright State University, Dayton, OH	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Yeshiva University - Bronx, NY	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
York University, Ontario	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
<b>Score not included on Report:</b>	1	1			
<b>GRAND TOTAL:</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>54.36</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>45.64</b>

## January 1999 Oral Exam Results

School	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
Adelphi University	5	2	40.00	3	60.00
Arizona State University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
American Commonwealth University, San Diego	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Boston University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Brigham Young University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Baylor University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Biola University, La Mirada	4	4	100.00	0	00.00
City University of New York	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
California Coast University - <i>GRANDFATHER ONLY</i>	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
California Graduate Institute, West Los Angeles	22	6	27.27	16	72.73
California Graduate School of Family Psychology	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
California Graduate School of Marital & Family The	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
California Institute of Integral Studies, S.F.	8	6	75.00	2	25.00
California School of Professional Psychology, Berkeley	58	30	51.72	28	48.28
California School of Professional Psychology, Fresno	11	5	45.45	6	54.55
California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles	65	33	50.77	32	49.23
California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego	29	17	58.62	12	41.38
California State University, Los Angeles	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Cambridge Graduate School of Psychology, Los Angeles	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Center for Psychological Studies, Albany	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
Claremont Graduate School, Claremont	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Depaul University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara	7	4	57.14	3	42.86
Florida Institute of Technology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena	9	5	55.56	4	44.44
Humanistic Psychological Institute	1	0	00.00	1	100.00

(Continued on page 20)



## January 1999 Oral Exam Results

(Continued from page 19)

School	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
Illinois School of Professional Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Indiana University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, Menlo Park	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Michigan State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Minnesota School of Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
New York University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Northern California Graduate University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Northwestern University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Nova Southwestern University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
New School for Social Research	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Newport University, Newport Beach	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Ohio State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Out-Of-Country	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Out-of-State	11	7	63.64	4	36.36
Punjab University, India	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	22	13	59.09	9	40.91
Pacifica Graduate Institute, Santa Clara	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Pepperdine University, Malibu	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Professional School of Psychological Studies	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Professional School of Psychology	7	2	28.57	5	71.43
Rutgers	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Rosebridge Graduate School of Integrative Psychology	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Rosemead School of Psychology, La Mirada	5	3	60.00	2	40.00
Ryokan College, Los Angeles	7	3	42.86	4	57.14
Suny Albany	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Suny Binghamton	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
San Diego State University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Sierra University/A University Without Walls	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
State Univ. of New York, Stony Brook	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Temple University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Texas Tech University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
The San Francisco School of Psychology	4	0	00.00	4	100.00
Tufts University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
UC, Berkeley	4	3	75.00	1	25.00
UC, Los Angeles	10	5	50.00	5	50.00
UC, San Diego	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
UC, San Francisco	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
UC, Santa Barbara	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Union Institute	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
University Arkansas	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University California Irvine	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University California Santa Cruz	1	1	100.00	0	00.00

(Continued on page 21)





## January 1999 Oral Exam Results

(Continued from page 20)

School	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
University Cincinnati	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Denver	6	4	66.67	2	33.33
University Hartford	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University Illinois at Chicago	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Miami	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University Michigan	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University Minnesota, Duluth	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Oregon	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University Pennsylvania	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University South Florida	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Tennessee, Knoxville	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Texas, Austin	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
University Virginia	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Union Institute	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
United States International University, San Diego	31	12	38.71	19	61.29
University for Humanistic Studies, San Diego	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
University of Maryland, College Park	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Oklahoma	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of San Diego, San Diego	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of San Francisco, San Francisco	6	2	33.33	4	66.67
University of Southern California, Los Angeles	11	6	54.55	5	45.45
University of the Pacific, Stockton	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Virginia Commonwealth University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Wayne State University, Michigan	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Western Michigan University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Washington State University	4	4	100.00	0	00.00
West Virginia University	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Western Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
William Lyon University, San Diego	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Wisconsin School of Professional Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Wright Institute Los Angeles, Los Angeles	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
Wright Institute, Berkeley	16	7	43.75	9	56.25
Yale University - New Haven	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
York University, Ontario	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
<b>Score not included:</b>	1	1			
<b>*GRAND TOTAL:</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>51.86</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>48.14</b>

\*Total includes scores for the *Jurisprudence & Professional Ethics Oral Examination*.



*The Board of  
Psychology is  
committed to the  
protection of the  
health, safety,  
and welfare of  
consumers of  
psychological  
services.*



## *Board Meeting & Examination Calendar*

<i>Date</i>	<i>Event</i>	<i>Location</i>
<b>YEAR 1999</b>		
May 14–15, 1999	Board Meeting	Los Angeles
June 19, 1999	Oral Examination	Los Angeles
June 26, 1999	Oral Examination	Burlingame
August 13–14, 1999	Board Meeting	San Jose
August 20–24, 1999	APA Annual Meeting	Boston, MA
Sept. 29–Oct. 3, 1999	ASPPB Annual Meeting	Louisville, KY
October 13, 1999	Written Examination	Northern/Southern CA
November 4, 1999	Strategic Planning Session	San Diego
November 5–6, 1999	Board Meeting	San Diego
<b>YEAR 2000</b>		
January 8, 2000	Oral Examination	Los Angeles
January 15, 2000	Oral Examination	Burlingame
February 18–19, 2000	Item Writer's Workshop	Sacramento
February 24–27, 2000	ASPPB Mid-Winter Meeting	Albuquerque, NM
March 3–4, 2000	Board Meeting	Sacramento
March 11, 2000	Item Writer's Workshop	Sacramento
March 23–26, 2000	CPA Annual Meeting	San Jose, Fairmont Hotel
April 12, 2000	Written Examination	Northern/Southern CA
May 12, 13, 2000	Board Meeting	Los Angeles
June 17, 2000	Oral Examination	Los Angeles
June 24, 2000	Oral Examination	Burlingame
August 4–8, 2000	APA Annual Meeting	Washington D.C.
August 18–19, 2000	Board Meeting	San Francisco
October 11, 2000	Written Examination	Northern/Southern CA
October 18–22, 2000	ASPPB Annual Meeting	Location pending
November 3–4, 2000	Board Meeting	San Diego



## Board of Psychology Publications

**Y**ou no longer need to speak to a live person to request printed materials from the BOP. Our computer phone system is equipped to take requests for most of the Board's publications. To make such a request, simply call (916) 263-2699 and follow the computer's instructions to record your name, address, and the publications you need. Or email us: [bopmail@dca.ca.gov](mailto:bopmail@dca.ca.gov)

If you are ordering the *Laws & Regulations . . .*, please send your written request with a check for \$4.00 made out to the Board of Psychology, 1422 Howe Avenue, Suite 22, Sacramento CA 95825. The *Laws and Regulations* as well as many of the items listed below are available on the Board's web site: [www.dca.ca.gov/psych](http://www.dca.ca.gov/psych) or through links on the web site.

- *Laws & Regulations Relating to the Practice of Psychology* ..... \$4.00
- *Board of Psychology Disciplinary Guidelines* ..... Free
- *All About the California Board of Psychology* ..... Free
- *Do You Have a Complaint?* ..... Free
- *Everybody Has Problems* ..... Free
- *Professional Therapy Never Includes Sex*
  - Single copies ..... Free
  - Licensees may order in bulk from the Department of General Services.
  - Cost is 40 cents each, or packages of 25 for \$10.00 each. Call or write to BOP for an order form. Brochure is also available in Spanish.
- *Spectrum of Administrative Actions*
  - Available to the Board of Psychology* ..... Free
- *Continuing Education Brochure* ..... Free

## Did you know?

### HMO Consumer Complaint Hotline: 1-800-400-0815

**In the interest** of consumer protection, the Board of Psychology enthusiastically supports the Consumer Complaint Hotline of the Department of Corporations.

**The Board encourages** all licensees to post the hotline number in their offices so that HMO patients are aware of the recourse they may have in dealing with their managed care insurance carrier.

**A formal complaint** may be filed with the Department of Corporations after a patient has attempted all available remedies within the HMO grievance system. HMO personnel who are licensed psychologists must adhere to all ethical principles applicable to the profession, as well as all laws relating to psychology licensure.

## Important Notice

**E**ffective immediately, it is the policy of the Board of Psychology not to issue Psychologist initial licenses until criminal history clearances have been received from both the California Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). It may take 12 weeks or longer for both clearances to be received by the Board so you are advised to send your fingerprint cards with your application for a license. Additionally, smudged, illegible, or inappropriately applied fingerprints can result in substantial delay in this already long process. Therefore, the

Board strongly encourages you to have your fingerprints completed by an experienced law enforcement agency.

It is also the policy of the Board of Psychology to not issue any Psychological Assistant registrations or Registered Psychologist registrations until clearances are received from the California DOJ. The Board still requires FBI fingerprinting for these two registrations but will not delay the approval of the registrations for the extended time it takes to receive clearances from the FBI. Receiving clearances from the DOJ may take six

weeks. However, applicants can request an "expedited" fingerprint processing by DOJ when initially submitting the fingerprint cards by paying a \$66 expedited processing fee rather than the \$55 fingerprint card standard processing fee. Again, it is vital that the fingerprints are clear and readable, as smeared, illegible, or inappropriately applied fingerprints can result in substantial further delays.

This policy is consistent with procedures of other licensing boards and with the Board's primary mission of public protection. ♠



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
**BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY**  
1422 Howe Avenue, Suite 22  
Sacramento, CA 95825-3200

BULK RATE  
U.S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
PERMIT NO. 685

## BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY

1422 Howe Avenue, Suite 22  
Sacramento, CA 95825-3200  
(916) 263-2699

BOP ONLINE:  
[www.dca.ca.gov/psych](http://www.dca.ca.gov/psych)

### BOARD MEMBERS

*Judith Janaro Fabian, PhD*  
President  
*Martin Greenberg, PhD*  
Vice President  
*Pamela Harmell, PhD*  
*Linda Hee, PhD*  
*Emil Rodolfa, PhD*  
*Marilyn Palarea*  
*Mary McMillan*  
*Mary Ellen Early*  
*Lisa Kalustian*

### STAFF MEMBERS

*Thomas O'Connor, Executive Officer*  
*Suzanne Taylor, Enforcement Coordinator*  
*Jeffrey Thomas, Project Coordinator*  
*Karen Johnson, Licensing and  
Examination Coordinator*  
*Al Anquoe, Office Services Technician*  
*Tammey Bailey, Business Services Clerk*  
*Annette Brown, Licensing Analyst*  
*Kathi Burns, Enforcement Analyst*  
*Matt di Pirro, Student Assistant*  
*Wanda Hawkins, Continuing Education  
Technician*  
*Richard Hodgkin, Licensing Analyst*  
*Jeane Ward, Licensing Analyst*  
*Janet Wise, Enforcement Clerk*